CMP-SPRCM-75-20

SELECTIONS FROM PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA MAGAZINES

American Consulate General
Hong Kong, B. C. C.

July 14, 1975

U. I. C. C.
AUG 29 1975
LIBRARY

DISTRIBUTED BY:
NTIS
National Technical Information Service
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
CONSULATE GENERAL

CMP-SPRCM-75-20

Selections from People's Republic of China Magazines

American Consulate General
Hong Kong, B.C.C.

No. 829
July 14, 1975

This edition is printed in the United States of America for dissemination in the Western Hemisphere, Europe, the Mediterranean, and the west coast of Africa from material produced by the American Consulate General, Hong Kong. All queries concerning this edition should be sent to:

National Technical Information
Service (152.12)
U.S. Department of Commerce
Springfield, Virginia 22151

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/)

Lenin's Struggle To Restrict Bourgeois Right after the October Revolution - by Hung Hsüan 1

Bourgeois Right Must Be Restricted 12

The Struggle Between the Western Han Dynasty and the Restorationist Forces of Liu Pi, Etc. - by Shih Chung 18

Yesterday and Today - by Shih Hsing 29

* * *

PRICES SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Reproduced by
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
US Department of Commerce
Springfield, VA 22151

Selections from People's Republic of China Magazines

Lenin's Struggle To Restrict Bourgeois Right After the October Revolution

by

Hung Hsüan (红宣)

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 2, April 20, 1975)

After the October Revolution, Lenin, the great teacher of the proletarian revolution, carried out a tireless struggle against bourgeois right existing in Soviet society with a view to consolidating and strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat and preventing capitalist restoration. By his theoretical and practical activities centering around the question of restricting bourgeois right in this period, Lenin defended and developed the Marxist doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Bourgeois right is an expression of capitalist relations of commodity economy, a "bourgeois limitation." As "right can never be higher than the economic structure of society and its cultural development conditioned hereby,"* socialist society which has just emerged from the womb of the old capitalist society cannot but retain part of the defects of bourgeois right. Not only must the proletariat recognize this inevitable reality, but it must work harder still to break this bourgeois limitation.

Following the success of the October Revolution, the triumphant Russian proletariat was faced with the new problem of how to consolidate its dictatorship and prevent a restoration of capitalism. At that time, besides rebuffing the armed intervention of the imperialists and suppressing the resistance and revolts of the landlord and capitalist masses, there was an even more formidable and complicated task, namely to restrict bourgeois right, gradually dig away the soil engendering new bourgeois elements, and create conditions in which it would be impossible for the bourgeoisie to exist, or for a new bourgeoisie to arise. In many important works such as "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government," "Draft Program of the Russian Communist (B) Party," "Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," "A Great Beginning," "'Left-Wing' Communism, An Infantile Disorder" and "On Cooperation," Lenin time and again explained that the existence of bourgeois right in respect to the ownership of the means of production, exchange and distribution provided an important economic basis for engendering new bourgeois elements as well as fertile soil for capitalist restoration. To remove this old root for capitalist restoration Lenin carried out a struggle in more than one way.

Bourgeois right recognizes the means of production as individual private property and defends the principle of sacrosanctity of private

---

* "Critique of the Gotha Program," Selected Works of Marx and Engels, Vol. III, p. 12.

property, whereas socialism calls for converting the means of production into public property. After seizing political power by force of arms, the proletariat must immediately proceed to change the system of private ownership of the means of production by the landlord and bourgeois classes, to make the most radical rupture with the traditional relations of ownership, and abolish bourgeois right in this sphere. The sound of the cannon fired aboard the Cruiser A-fu-lo-erh broke the silence over the sky of Petersburg, and armed workers stormed the winter palace and overthrew the provisional bourgeois government, thereby paving the way for this change. To turn Marx's famous formula -- "expropriate the expropriators" -- into the reality of nationalized land, banks and factories, Lenin drafted the famous land laws at a time when he was tensely directing the armed uprising. Later, Lenin wrote the regulations governing the workers' control and the laws governing the nationalization of banks, signed the laws nationalizing all big industries, and launched the struggle in which "Red guards attack capital." At that time, the Russian banking capitalists staged a slowdown in a vain attempt to strangle the Soviet government economically. This forced Lenin to take most resolute measures, drawing on the lessons of the Paris Commune in dealing with French banks. He said: "We have armed workers and peasants. They should take over all private banks this morning."* This was done. On December 14, 1917, fighters of the "La-t'o-wei-ya group," acting on the orders of the People's Commissariat led by Lenin, set out at 7 a.m. and by before 11 a.m. had seized the stubborn citadel of the financial capitalists and completed the procedures of nationalization for all 28 banks in Petersburg. By the end of 1920, some 4,500 enterprises had been nationalized. Naturally, the fact that banks, railways, merchant ships, foreign trade and factories were turned over to the state did not mean that everything would be smooth sailing from then on. Far from it. Within state enterprises a violent struggle still existed, there being the question of what line to follow. In those enterprises where power was not genuinely in the hands of the proletariat, work was made a pretty mess. "After nationalization, some factories are still typical examples of disorganization, laxity, filth, squabbling, and laziness."** Lenin criticized the Soviet newspapers for failing to forcefully expose these "stark" facts, stressing that "unless we struggle against these 'preservers of capitalist traditions,' we will not fulfill our bounden duties. If we tacitly tolerate these factories, we will not be communists but useless persons."*** Lenin bitterly hated these "preservers of capitalist traditions" which were under the socialist system of whole-people ownership in form but were in fact seeking the gain for a

---

* "Report on the Work of the People's Commissariat," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. III, p. 429.

** "On the Nature of Our Newspapers," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. III, p. 601.

*** Ibid.

few people, and called on all to expose and criticize these typical examples and struggle against them uncompromisingly.

After land was nationalized, land that belonged to landlords, the royal households and churches was without exception handed to the peasants without compensation. The peasants received a total of over 150 million (Russian) mow of land, and were relieved of the burden of paying the landlords some 500 million rubles in rent annually. However, the small-peasant economy was an economy at a cross-road; peasants, as small producers, were half toilers and half private owners. Land nationalization alone in a country where the small-peasant economy was as vast as the ocean could in no way bring about solid socialism. Therefore, Lenin devoted extremely serious attention to the socialist transformation of agriculture, positively guiding the peasants to embark on the road of socialist collectivization. At that time, practice had created three forms of socialist transformation of agriculture, that is, the state farm, agricultural commune, and joint-tilling society (cooperative society). Lenin regarded the state farm as the base for socialist transformation and development of the agricultural productivity in the rural areas. The state farm on the "vacant plot of the forest" in the Ma-erh-tsai-wu--Pu-lo-to-wu village near Moscow was built on Lenin's initiative. Sparing no effort to foster the development of the agricultural commune, Lenin said: "We encourage the formation of communes, but we should run them well to win the confidence of the peasants."* Even when he was taken ill and had to lie in bed, Lenin still wrote "On Cooperation," a programmatic document on the socialist transformation of agriculture. Although Lenin did not see the nationwide realization of agricultural collectivization, he had planned the road of advance for this victorious march: When carrying out socialist transformation of agriculture, the Party must firmly rely on the poor peasants and be good at uniting with the middle peasants. The cooperatives having been organized, it must still continue to exert efforts at effecting the transition from small collective to big collective and from big collective to whole-people ownership. But before whole-people ownership was realized, peasants inevitably retained certain habits of small producers. Unless this was given full attention and unless active guidance continued to be given to the peasants, "the small commodity-producers' cooperatives (and it is the latter, and not the workers' cooperatives, that we are discussing as the predominant and typical form in a small-peasant country) inevitably give rise to petty-bourgeois capitalist relations, facilitate their development, push small capitalists into the foreground and benefit them most."** If the small collective economy of the peasants did not continue to advance, it would regress. So, throughout the entire period of transition it was necessary to give peasants socialist education.

---

* "Report on Rural Work," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. III, p. 803.

** "On the Tax in Kind," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. IV, p. 522.

Capitalism is born of commodity production. The principle of exchange of equivalents is practiced in the exchange of commodities. In socialist society, as long as money still exists, the law of value will operate and the soil engendering capitalism will still remain. Lenin attached extreme importance to restricting bourgeois right in this sphere, and advocated that the production and distribution of goods should be subjected to strict state control and planned and organized distribution of goods should gradually take the place of free trade throughout the country in order to fully exercise the dictatorship of the proletariat. As Lenin said, the question of accounting and control for the production and distribution of goods "becomes a basic question of socialist revolution the second day after the bourgeoisie is overthrown."* Lenin believed that without all-round state accounting and control of the production and distribution of goods and if free trade were allowed to assume disastrous proportions, the political power of the proletariat could not be sustained, "and the restoration of the capitalist system of oppression becomes inevitable."**

To restrict free trade and attack profiteering, the state must have control of products having an important bearing on the national planning and the people's livelihood," with "state monopoly of grain and other goods of necessity."+ In this respect the struggle was sharp and acute. Take grain for example. According to the figures of 26 provinces compiled by the Central Statistics Bureau of Soviet Russia, out of a total of 121 million poods of grain supplied to the residents in 1918, 56.3 percent was supplied by profiteers, with the remainder supplied by the grain department of the People's Commissariat. "Black-market prices of grain are ten times the state fixed price,"++ or even higher. In September 1918 profiteers bought and shipped out over 4.5 million poods of grain from grain producing provinces and sold them on the market. In April 1920, the state fixed price of grain in Moscow city was 9.77 rubles per pood, whereas free market price was 724.62 rubles. The black-market price was 73 times higher than the state price. The rural rich -- the kulaks -- not only went into action themselves in "disrupting the fixed prices, they are profiteering in grain, they are making a hundred, two hundred and more rubles profit on every pood of grain; they are disrupting the grain monopoly and the proper distribution of grain."+++ They also instigated the poor peasants to engage in such profiteering activities.

---

* "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. III, p. 506.

** Ibid., pp. 506-507.

\+ "How To Organize Competition?" Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. III, p. 393.

++ "Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. IV, p. 88.

+++ "On the Famine," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. III, p. 560.

For instance, a certain poor peasant was given one pood of grain, but was required to pay not six but three rubles so that this corrupted poor peasant might also "enjoy" the speculative benefit and make "a bit" by selling this pood of grain for 150 rubles. By means like this, they instigated the poor peasants to oppose the Soviet government which prohibited private buying and selling of grain. And the "Left" Social-revolutionaries, Mensheviks and other counter-revolutionaries, who represented the interests of the kulaks, went about everywhere agitating for opposition to the grain monopoly, "protesting" against sale of grain by franchise, and calling for raising the fixed prices and permitting private individuals to engage in free trade. To smash the schemes of the class enemies Lenin issued this call: "A great 'crusade' must be organized against the grain profiteers, the kulaks, the parasites, the disorganizers and bribe-takers," "against the violators of strictest state order in the collection, transportation and distribution of bread for the people and bread for the machines."* At the same time, banning and punishing according to law grain profiteering became an important task for the All-Russia Commission for the Suppression of Counter-Revolution. Grain profiteers were sent to prison for ten years or more. On Lenin's proposal, workers by the tens of thousands were organized into grain requisitioning teams which were sent to the rural areas to rally the poor peasants to break the resistance of the kulaks and profiteers who hoarded and traded in grain, and whose grain was seized and supplied to the army and the starving workers. In addition, the Soviet government directly issued laws and decrees banning the free market. At that time, the free market in the Su-ha-lieh-fu-k'a Square, Moscow, was a center for black-market activities of profiteers and grain sellers, and "Su-ha-lieh-fu-k'a" became another name for profiteering. In accordance with the spirit of Lenin's instruction on combating profiteering activities, the Soviet government in Moscow in 1920 ordered the closure of this free market. Lenin ardently praised this revolutionary action and made new and higher demands on struggle in this respect. He said: "We have already struggled against 'Su-ha-lieh-fu-k'a' ..... 'Su-ha-lieh-fu-k'a' has been closed, but what is to be feared is not the 'Su-ha-lieh-fu-k'a' that has been closed. It was not difficult to close the old 'Su-ha-lieh-fu-k'a' in Su-ha-lieh-fu-k'a Square. What is to be dreaded is the 'Su-ha-lieh-fu-k'a' that lives in the heart and act of every small proprietor. This 'Su-ha-lieh-fu-k'a' must be closed. It is the foundation of capitalism, and as long as it exists, capitalists may return to Russia and become even stronger than we are. This must be clearly understood. It should be the main motive force for our work and the condition and yardstick for measuring our practical achievements."**

So long as commodity production goes on, money -- a "special commodity" used as a general equivalent -- will still exist. The proletariat, having seized power, may more quickly deprive the exploiting

---

* Ibid., p. 564.

** "Report on the Work of the People's Commissariat," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. IV, pp. 398-399.

classes of the means of production, but the monetary system will be retained. And it will take many, many years to abolish money and commodity production. So long as exchange through money exists, equality will always exist in words and in law, and not in reality. There is the possibility that every man who possesses a large amount of money may use this "remnant of yesterday's exploitation"* to carry out new actual exploitation. "Among the residents bourgeois elements can continue to use the still privately-owned paper money, an instrument which entitles exploiters to obtain social wealth, to engage in speculation, get rich and plunder the laborers."** Lenin believed that "relying only on nationalization of banks is not enough in our struggle against such pernicious remnants of bourgeois plunder."+ The proletariat must do its best to carry out the most drastic measures adequately and speedily to prepare for the abolition of money, first of all replacing money with such things as bankbooks, checks and short-term coupons in order that experience may be gradually gained and accumulated in practice before determining the kind of methods that are most effective in restricting bourgeois right in this respect. In order to elucidate the idea of the proletariat to use money in order to abolish money, Lenin especially wrote the essay "The Importance of Gold Now and After the Complete Victory of Socialism," pointing out that when we were victorious on a world scale, "we shall use gold for the purpose of building public lavatories in the streets of some of the largest cities in the world." Meanwhile, he said, we must save gold and use money, that is, "when living among wolves, howl like wolves." Our aim was to "exterminate all the wolves, as would be done in a rational human society."++

It was in keeping with the wave-like development of the situation that Lenin conducted his struggle to restrict bourgeois right in the field of exchange. The civil war and the imperialist armed intervention from 1918 to 1920 seriously disrupted the national economy and hindered the rehabilitation of the productive forces. The difficulties were compounded by the 1920 crop failure. The situation of the struggle demanded that the Party forthwith take prompt, most resolute and most urgent measures to improve the living condition of the peasants, raise productivity and activate the countrywide economy. In the spring of 1921, the Party's 10th Congress, in accordance with Lenin's proposal, changed the system for the collection of surplus grain and introduced a new economic policy featuring a grain tax, freedom of trade and a system of lease and

---

* "Deception of the People with Slogans of Freedom and Equality," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. III, p. 838.

** "Draft Program of the Russian Communist (B) Party," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. III, p. 750.

\+ Ibid.

++ "The Importance of Gold Now and After the Complete Victory of Socialism," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. IV, pp. 578-579.

transfer. Lenin pointed out that freedom of trade would encourage the capitalist elements inside the country and could not but strengthen the hand of capitalism in a certain degree. Thus, he said, the new economic policy was a temporary retreat under the force of circumstances, a "special transitional method," "a new flanking movement." Such retreat was "in order to make better preparations for a new offensive against capitalism."* Lenin confidently predicted: "Russia of the new economic policy will become socialist Russia."** At the Party's 11th Congress in the spring of 1922, Lenin declared explicitly: "We have retreated for one year. Now we should say on behalf of the Party: That's enough! The aim of the retreat has been achieved. This period is about to end or may be said to have already ended."+ Here we can see a typical example of how Lenin scientifically integrated the firmness of principle with tactical flexibility.

In socialist society bourgeois right is still predominant in the sphere of distribution. The enforcement of the principle -- "He who does not work, neither shall he eat" -- is undoubtedly a historical step in the right direction. But this progressive step is very limited. Since people differ in their capacity for labor and in the burdens they have to carry, the implementation of the principle "distribution according to work" will naturally result in the creation of differences in the degree of wealth among people. This is a defect. Before the October Revolution, Lenin had stated explicitly: Carrying out the principle of the Paris Commune with regard to the wage system was one of the basic attributes of proletarian political power, a principle that equally applied to "technicians, supervisors, accountants and all public functionaries."++ The moment the October Revolution was victorious, the Soviet government promulgated laws and decrees which, among other things, reduced the high salaries to the wage level of the average worker according to the Commune principles. Subsequently, in view of the need to employ bourgeois specialists Lenin in the spring of 1918 proposed a policy of paying bourgeois specialists high salaries. However, he stressed that this was a "tribute" to the bourgeois specialists, and the purpose of doing this was to "use the bourgeois specialists to re-plow the soil so that absolutely under no circumstances will a new capitalist class arise from this soil."+++ Lenin said that

---

* "The Role and Functions of the Trade Unions Under the New Economic Policy," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. IV, p. 582.

** "Speech at the Plenary Session of Moscow Soviet," Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XXXIII, p. 401.

\+ "The 11th Congress of the Russian Communist (B) Party," Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XXXIII, p. 246.

++ "The State and Revolution," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. III, p. 213.

+++ "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. III, p. 501.

this measure was apparently a compromise, a temporary measure, and that "the corrupting influence of high salaries" would be felt "upon the Soviet authorities" and "upon the masses of the workers."* Bukharin and the like contended that paying high salaries to specialists was "in no way contrary to principles." But Lenin pointed out categorically: This "is a retreat from the principles of the Paris Commune and any proletarian regime" and "to conceal from the masses this fact would be sinking to the level of bourgeois politicians and to deceiving the masses."**

The differences in the wage scales adopted after the October Revolution were comparatively small. In 1919, the commissar of the laboring people reported to Lenin thus: The work that we have done in balancing wages has never been done and will not be done within the next several decades by any bourgeois state. This was indeed so. Before the First World War, the wage of a casual worker in Russia was one ruble a day or 25 rubles a month, while the monthly wage of a specialist was 500 rubles, more than 20 times higher than that of the worker, not to mention those privileged drawing a monthly salary of several hundred thousand rubles. In the Soviet Russia of 1919, the wage scales ranged from approximately 600 to 3,000 rubles, a difference of only five times. Lenin said: "To narrow the differences between minimum and maximum wages, we have done a lot of work and must continue to do so in the future."*** The 10th Party Congress held in 1921 stressed the need to reduce the wage differentials between various scales and to effect distribution of articles of consumption on a more egalitarian basis as far as possible. The 11th Party Congress held in 1922 pointed out the need to resolutely put an end to the huge differences in the wages of communists in various sectors, to struggle against the phenomenon of fostering bourgeois habits within the Party by taking advantage of the new economic policy, to curb the attempts of leaders of the Communist Party to amass personal fortunes. The 12th Party Congress held in 1923 further made it clear that the general wage policy for the future should be: to equalize more or less the wages in all industrial departments and to reduce the imbalance of material supplies within the Party. Moreover, the Congress pointed out that such material supply imbalance contained a particularly serious danger, and that not even for one minute should we overlook the danger of some cells of the Party degenerating.

Lenin constantly warned all Party members that they could not and should not ask for special privileges for themselves, and ruled that those who were in charge of work had no right to draw special salaries, bonuses or extra remunerations. Regarding this, Lenin himself set an example.

---

* Ibid., pp. 503-504.

** Ibid., pp. 502-503.

*** "Conference of the Petergrad Soviet," Complete Works of Lenin, Vol. XXIX, p. 17.

Toiling for the revolution day and night in the most difficult months and years, he ate the same brown bread as the ordinary workers, and his salary was not higher than that of a skilled worker. Once, the director of the general service department of the People's Commissariat, out of his love and concern for the health of Lenin, raised the latter's salary to 300 rubles without authorization. When Lenin knew about this, he immediately pointed out sternly: This was an illegal act, a direct violation of the ruling laid down by the People's Commissariat on November 23, 1917, and severely cautioned him.

Lenin's struggle to restrict bourgeois right in the sphere of distribution was linked with the realization of the lofty communist tasks. To attain the goal of building a communist society "it is not enough to take over the factories, land and other means of production, not enough to carry out strict accounting and control of the production and distribution of goods; it is also necessary to further implement the principle -- from each according to his best and to each according to his needs."* Although we cannot as yet fully achieve this at once, no communist should forget his own faith and the ultimate goal of struggle, let alone be dazzled by the material world of pleasure and succumb to such rubbish principles as "material incentives," "bonuses," etc. Instead, every communist should firmly put proletarian politics in command and actively create the conditions in which to fight for the realization of complete communism.

To restrict bourgeois right the proletariat must energetically foster the shoots of new things and pay attention to the great creations in the struggle of the worker and peasant masses. On May 7, 1919, communists and Party activists of the Moscow-Kazan Railway, to support the internal struggle against the white bandits' armed rebellion, proposed to perform unpaid communist voluntary labor on Saturdays until the complete defeat of Kolchak. Laying hold of this communist shoot of extremely vital significance, Lenin believed that "this is the beginning of a change which is more difficult, more important, more profound and more decisive than the overthrow of the bourgeoisie."** ".....the unpaid work of individual persons, unregulated by any government or state, performed on a wide scale for the public good." "If there is anything communistic in our present system in Russia it is the subbotniks, and only the subbotniks; everything else is but a fight against capitalism for the consolidation of socialism."*** On May 1, 1920, together with the workers, clerks and students of the military school, Lenin took part in the voluntary labor of cleaning the Kremlin Square.

---

* "Report on the Revision of the Party Program and Changing the Party's Name," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. III, p. 476.

** "A Great Beginning," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. IV, p. 1.

*** "Subbotniks," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. IV, p. 143.

Lenin also expressed great concern for public dining rooms, crèches, kindergartens -- examples of the new shoots of communism, and he pointed out: "Here we have the simple, everyday means, involving nothing pompous, grandiloquent or ceremonial, which can in actual fact emancipate women, which can in actual fact lessen and abolish their inequality with men as regards their role in social production and public life."* The young shoots of communism are the opposites of bourgeois right. Lenin held the view that with the support of the proletarian state regime, these young shoots would not perish but would grow sturdily, defeat bourgeois right and develop into complete communism.

To restrict bourgeois right it is imperative to intensify communist education and banish the idea of bourgeois right. The kernel of the idea of bourgeois right is the system of gradation of social rank. Lenin firmly opposed any special privileges enjoyed by workers of the Party and the state, and bitterly denounced those who wanted to "turn knowledge into the special right of protecting the moneybags"** as lackeys of the bourgeoisie. He called for a repeated and untiring struggle to uproot the weeds of bureaucracy and an attack on acts of using one's post and authority to do things in violation of law and discipline. In 1921, a soldier of the Red Army came to Moscow to report to Lenin: Certain functionaries in Tunho (顿河) province had used their posts and authority to feather their own nests. Lenin immediately transmitted a copy of the letter reporting on the actual situation to the Secretariat of the Central Committee, with the recommendation that the Central Committee appoint an ad hoc committee composed of several comrades and despatch it to Tunho to make an investigation and to seriously deal with those whose crimes of violating law and discipline were proven. Lenin himself always appeared as an ordinary laborer. In 1920, he wanted to borrow several books on philosophy for reference, and specially wrote a note to the library of the Lu-mien-tsai-fu Museum, saying: According to regulations, no reference books are to be borrowed out of the library; in that case, would it be possible to let me have them for one night after the library had closed so that I could return them early the next morning? During the difficult years of the civil war, the peasants, Red Army soldiers and comrades in the provinces, concerned over Lenin's health, sent him some food -- flour, chicken eggs, fruit. Lenin turned over all these gifts to the hospital, kindergartens and the army hospital and to those comrades who needed these foods. The director of a state farm in the suburbs of Moscow city, while Lenin was confined to bed after he was stabbed, wanted to present him with a basket of fruit. Lenin severely criticized him and ordered him to present the fruit immediately to the children's sanatorium. These noble actions on the part of Lenin were a forceful criticism of the idea of bourgeois right.

The fact that bourgeois right exists and must be restricted in socialist society shows that this in itself is a process of dialectical

---

* "A Great Beginning," Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. IV, p. 18.

** "How To Organize Competition?" Selected Works of Lenin, Vol. III, p. 394.

development. Lenin's struggle to restrict bourgeois right after the October Revolution was fraught with revolutionary dialectics. There are not only essential differences but also definite links between the socialist system and the capitalist system--and the existence, gradual reduction and eventual abolition of bourgeois right are the necessary end result of the interaction and struggle between such differences and links. Our purpose of recognizing it is no more than to restrict and abolish it.

However, bourgeois right as a stubborn citadel cannot be taken at one swoop. The struggle waged by the proletariat to restrict bourgeois right is inevitably a protracted process. That part of bourgeois right which still exists in socialist society is a hotbed for the restoration of capitalism by the bourgeoisie and all other exploiting classes as well as by their agents within the Party. The enemies of the proletariat always try by a thousand and one means to intensify and extend bourgeois right and carry out criminal activities of reviving capitalism by making use of the idea of bourgeois right which still exists among the cadres and the masses. Following its rise to power, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has completely betrayed Lenin's cause and restored capitalism in Lenin's homeland. Bourgeois right is not only predominant in regard to exchange and distribution but has also made a comeback to the field of property relations. This is a grave lesson. We must, in accordance with Chairman Mao's teachings, read some more Marxist-Leninist books, raise our consciousness of the need to follow the Party's basic line, persist in exercising all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie, and carry the struggle to restrict bourgeois right through to the end!

* * *

Bourgeois Right Must Be Restricted

- Some understanding from studying "Critique of the Gotha Program"

by

Workers Theoretical Group, Peking Municipal General Trade Union Council

and

Workers Theoretical Study Group, Peking Teachers Training College

(Li Shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 2, April 20, 1975)

Chairman Mao has recently called upon us to "read some more Marxist-Leninist books." In studying at this juncture Chairman Mao's important instructions on the question of theory, re-studying great teacher Marx's brilliant work "Critique of the Gotha Program" he wrote a hundred years ago imparts a particularly intimate feeling and enables us to understand Chairman Mao's instructions more deeply.

In waging an uncompromising struggle against Lassallean opportunism Marx in his work for the first time established the thesis regarding the two stages of development of communism. He further developed his theory of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat with this thesis: "Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat." Proletarian dictatorship provides a fundamental guarantee for consolidating and developing socialism, one that insures that the proletariat will defeat the bourgeois and score victory for socialism in the struggle between the two roads.

Lenin also pointed out that the dictatorship of the proletariat must be upheld for the entire socialist period. He regarded this as a touchstone for distinguishing genuine from sham Marxism. The Soviet revisionist renegade clique has completely betrayed Marxism-Leninism, unabashedly declaring in their own program that "the dictatorship of the proletariat is no longer necessary in the Soviet Union" and advocating a "state of the whole people." People like Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao also do their best to oppose the dictatorship of the proletariat, amply revealing they all are the sworn enemies of the proletarian dictatorship.

Chairman Mao recently instructed us: "Why did Lenin speak of exercising dictatorship over the bourgeoisie? This question must be thoroughly understood. Lack of clarity on this question will lead to revisionism. This should be made known to the whole nation." He also pointed out incisively: "China is a socialist country. Before liberation she was much the same as a capitalist country. Even now she

practices an eight-grade wage system, distribution according to work and exchange through money, and in this differs little from the old society. What is different is that the system of ownership has been changed." "Our country at present practices the commodity system, and the wage system is unequal too, as in the eight-grade wage scale, and so on. These can only be restricted under the dictatorship of the proletariat."

In socialist society private ownership of the means of production is abolished to make way for the establishment of socialist ownership by the whole people and collective ownership by the laboring masses. However, bourgeois right in respect to ownership has not been completely abolished. It continues to exist to a serious extent in the mutual relationship between men, occupying a dominant position in distribution.

In socialist society the relationship which existed in the old society such as the domination and oppression of the proletariat and the toiling people by the landlord and bourgeois classes has been reversed, the relationship of exploitation of man by man negated. "Except for his own labor, none under the changed circumstances can provide anything else." However, because of the continued existence of the three major differences, it would not be possible for people to completely break down the fetters of social division of work left over by the old society; there is still inequality in the mutual relationship between men.

In the distribution of the means of consumption socialist society practices the socialist principle "He who does not work, neither shall he eat" and "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." Compared with the phenomenon in capitalist society, such as "he who labors gains nothing while he who gains does not labor," the principle of "distribution to each according to his work" is a progressive step. Here, everybody regards labor as the sole yardstick for distributing items for individual consumption. On the surface this appears equal. But "this kind of equal right is unequal right in terms of dissimilar labor," is still bourgeois right. This is because some people possess greater labor power, some in lesser degree; some bear a heavier burden, some a lighter burden. Hence, applying the same yardstick in dealing with laborers with different conditions will inevitably bring about differences in wealth, the existence of inequality in fact.

The existence in socialist society of two kinds of socialist ownership, that is, ownership by the whole people and collective ownership, determines the practice of the commodity system in socialist society. This results in the continued existence of economic activities related to the commodity system, such as commodity, value, money and price. While exchange by means of commodity and money under socialist public ownership embodies the mutual relationship between the laborers themselves rather than the private owners, commodity production and pricing are under the unified leadership of state economic planning and the Party's policies. However, it is inevitable for the contradictions inherent in the commodity system to remain and those that are reflected in the fetish worshippers of commodity and money to exist.

In "Critique of the Gotha Program" Marx pointed out that "just as socialist society emerges from capitalist society; which is thus in every respect, economically, morally and intellectually, still stamped with the birthmarks of the old society from whose womb it emerges." As a manifestation of these birthmarks bourgeois right is thus a kind of "defect," something that must be uprooted upon the realization of communism. In dealing with bourgeois right, Chairman Mao has instructed us: "This can only be restricted under the dictatorship of the proletariat." In other words, we must uphold the continued revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat so as to create conditions for its gradual elimination. Before conditions for its eradication are available, forcible measures must then be adopted to restrict it, weaken and reduce it step by step. Otherwise, if bourgeois right and that part of inequality it brings are allowed to widen and grow in strength, notions about seeking fame and gain, going after the pleasures of life, becoming overlords sitting on the backs of the people, and taking to leisure and shunning labor will spread unchecked. Given the condition of the extensive relationships between commodity and money, a few people can manage to acquire more and more commodities and money through certain legitimate and often illegitimate channels. This will give rise to a situation marked by the two extremes, in which commodity and money are transformed into capital and labor power transformed into capitalist exploitation of commodity. This will bring about a situation in which certain departments and units come under the manipulation of revisionists who begin to change the nature of ownership and disintegrate the socialist economy. Similarly, certain people will regard culture, science and management knowhow as their private property, using their power to obtain privileges for themselves, to oppose Party leadership and oppose the socialist system. This results in the possible emergence of a few new bourgeois elements in complete betrayal of the proletariat and the laboring people. The existence of bourgeois right is therefore an important economic base for engendering new bourgeois elements.

Under the dictatorship of the proletariat the struggle revolving around the question of restricting or widening bourgeois right is essentially the struggle between the two lines, that of upholding socialism or restoring capitalism, practicing Marxism or promoting revisionism. Guided by Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, our Party has adopted numerous revolutionary measures, such as reducing wage differences, rusticating the educated youths, the participation of cadres in collective productive labor and taking the May 7 road by the workers, peasants, soldiers, students and trade workers, revolution in education and public health, building contingents of worker-peasant-soldier theorists, and the integration of intellectuals with the worker-peasant-soldier masses. All these measures are designed to restrict bourgeois right, gradually wipe out the three major differences, continuously weaken and uproot the breeding grounds for capitalism and revisionism and create conditions in which it will be impossible for the bourgeoisie to exist, or for a new bourgeoisie to arise. This is fraught with great current significance and far-reaching historical importance for consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat and preventing a capitalist restoration. Since the application of these major policies and measures has dashed the fond dreams of the overthrown exploiting classes and the newly engendered

bourgeois elements in vainly trying to restore capitalism, it has aroused their strong resistance and that of their agents within the Party. In the counter-revolutionary coup plan "Outline of 'Project 571'" the Lin Piao anti-Party clique maliciously vilified and attacked these socialist new things. They took advantage of bourgeois right and the idea of bourgeois right to incite a section of people to oppose the dictatorship of the proletariat and the socialist system. This despicable conspiracy has illustrated more than anything else that the struggle for and against restricting bourgeois right is an important aspect of the struggle between the two classes, the two roads and the two lines during the historical period of socialism. We should consistently uphold the exercise of all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie in all spheres and all stages of development of the revolution, consciously carrying on this round of struggle in triumph over a long period of time.

Chairman Mao recently pointed out with emphasis: "Lenin said, 'Small production engenders capitalism and the bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on a mass scale.' This also occurs among a section of the workers and a section of the Party members. Both within the ranks of the proletariat and among the personnel of state organs there are people who follow the bourgeois style of life." This important instruction of Chairman Mao's is an important summation of the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It also shows his great solicitude for the working class. The working class is the force guiding the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is entrusted with the historical mission of leading all the toiling masses to realize the great ideal of communism. To fulfill this historical mission we must constantly bear in mind Chairman Mao's teachings and persist in the continued revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Although we have now won a great victory, the defeated classes have not given up in their struggles. These people are still around and this class still exists. We must constantly guard against the restorationist activities of the landlord and bourgeois classes and against the subversive and aggressive conspiracies of social imperialism and imperialism. We must never remain inactive and negligent. At the same time we must soberly recognize the fact that since bourgeois right continues to exist in socialist society, where the soil and conditions for engendering new bourgeois elements are not lacking, the class enemy will certainly take advantage of bourgeois right and ideas of bourgeois right to attack the working class. Didn't the renegade, hidden traitor and scab Liu Shao-ch'i do his best to trumpet "material incentives" and "bonuses in command"? Didn't the renegade and traitor Lin Piao jot down in his notebooks revisionist remarks such as "material incentive is still necessary" and "use official appointments, fortune and favors as inducements"? This vicious approach is commonly used by the exploiting classes in conjunction with the employment of counter-revolutionary violence. The bourgeoisie has often used sugar-coated bullets to besiege, erode and disintegrate the ranks of the working class. Before the revolution ended in victory they employed despicable means to buy over scabs and foster worker-noblemen as lackeys for splitting the revolutionary ranks of the proletariat and as accomplices to wreck the proletarian revolution. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat they continue to employ this malicious approach, the only difference being the application

of such revisionist inducements as "incentive" or "principle" to lure those who have been seriously imbued with the bourgeois life-style and cherish aspirations for widening bourgeois right into a tool for subverting the dictatorship of the proletariat and restoring capitalism. Regarding this we must remain sober-minded and clear-headed.

In "Communist Manifesto," Marx and Engels pointed out: "Only the proletariat is a truly revolutionary class." Our working class represents advanced productive forces, devotes itself to the basic good without any thought of self. It is far-sighted, full of revolutionary thoroughness. Guided by Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, we are already able to unite the vast majority, shatter the class enemy's erosion and infiltration, wipe out the vestiges of the old society which inevitably remain in socialist society, and realize communism. This is beyond the slightest doubt. However, just as Lenin said: "Ay, the working class is not severed by a Chinese Wall from the old bourgeois society." ("Joint Session of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, the Moscow Soviet of Workers', Peasants' and Red Army Deputies and the Trade Unions") The struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, particularly the class struggle in the superstructure including all spheres of culture, the besieging of the spontaneous forces of small producers, and the vestiges of the old society such as bourgeois right exist objectively in socialist society. These are bound to be reflected in the ranks of the working class. Some people in our ranks have not completely freed themselves from the fetters of traditional concepts which arose from the base of centuries of private ownership. They have not been able to consciously resist the erosion of the bourgeoisie and the spontaneous forces of capitalism. On the other hand, the vast numbers of new workers that have joined our ranks have continuously provided the working class with new blood and fortified its strength. However, some people will inevitably bring to the workers ranks non-proletarian ideas and style of work. Since the pernicious influence of the revisionist line pushed by Liu Shao-ch'i, Lin Piao and their ilk, such as "material incentives" and "putting profit in command," has not been completely eliminated, the bourgeois life-style may prevail among the workers ranks. If we pay no heed to the transformation of our world outlook, if we are imbued with bourgeois notions and aspire to bourgeois life-style, we will care for only ourselves and forget the whole. If we go on practicing sectarianism and causing splits, bringing harm to the public good and feathering one's own nest, violating laws and breaking regulations, we will be defeated in the face of bourgeois attacks. We will even degenerate into new bourgeois elements and betray our own class. Our working class must therefore "make the most radical rupture with traditional property relations" and "make the most radical rupture with traditional ideas," resisting corrosion, never becoming contaminated and forever keeping the true revolutionary features of the working class. Cherishing the lofty ambition of "having the five continents in mind and carrying the revolutionary undertaking to its completion," we should use the advanced ideas of the proletariat and its indomitable revolutionary spirit to educate and influence the vast numbers of the laboring masses, give full play to the role of the leadership class, set an example for restricting bourgeois right and fight bravely for a consolidated dictatorship of the proletariat.

To carry the continued revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat to its completion, we must "read and study seriously and have a good grasp of Marxism." Chairman Mao looks upon this as a strategic measure for the purpose of combating and preventing revisionism and consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat. Historical experience tells us that relying solely on simple class sentiments without conscientiously studying Marxist-Leninist works and Chairman Mao's writings, we will become confused in theory and lose our bearings in practice. Some comrades put it rightly: "Groping in the dark in a theoretical sense disqualifies one as a fighter in the continued revolution." At the moment we must in particular study conscientiously and well Marxism-Leninism and Chairman Mao's thesis concerning the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. We must closely link our study with reality and strive to make clear why we should exercise dictatorship over the bourgeoisie, what are the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and distinguish capitalism from socialism when integrating theory with practice. As long as we persist in doing so, we shall be able to raise our ability to distinguish genuine from sham Marxism and heighten our awareness of implementing the Party's basic line.

Chairman Mao has taught us: "In the course of building socialist society everybody is in need of transformation." "The working class should transform society as a whole in the class struggle and in the struggle with nature, simultaneously transforme itself." ("On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People") Regarding the frenzied attacks unleashed by the landlord and bourgeois classes, whether we can discern, resist and persist in struggle, whether we approve of and aspire to or restrict and repudiate bourgeois right and the idea of bourgeois right, and whether we warmly support and actively foster or find fault with socialist new-born things--this, in the last analysis, is determined by whether or not we truly arm ourselves with the proletarian world outlook. Guided by the Marxist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat and in the practice of the three great revolutionary movements, we must consciously transform our world outlook, inherit and carry forward the glorious revolutionary tradition of the proletariat, and "maintain the same vigor and soaring revolutionary enthusiasm and indomitable spirit as was displayed during the period of the revolutionary wars and carry revolutionary work to its completion." Let us strive to win still greater victories in the struggle to combat and prevent revisionism, consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and prevent a capitalist restoration.

In "Critique of the Gotha Program" Marx said with foresight: "With the disappearance of class differences, all social and political inequalities arising from these differences will vanish." "Only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be crossed in its entirety and society inscribe on its banners: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!" The bright prospect of communism visualized by Marx can surely be realized. Illuminated by the radiance of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, let us persist in exercising all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie, uphold the continued revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and advance in triumph toward the great target of communism!

* * *

The Struggle Between the Western Han Dynasty and the Restorationist Forces of Liu Pi, Etc.

by

Shih Chung (史众)

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 2, April 20, 1975)

In the early years of Western Han, an exceptionally complicated situation emerged from the struggle for and against restoration between the restoration forces of the slave system and the landlord class. Not only must the dynamic and vigorous landlord class crush the restoration plots of the slave-owner class and guard against the potential threat of invasion by the Hun slave-owner aristocrats, it also had to solve a new problem, namely to fight against the power usurping activities of the various princes who had degenerated into political representatives of the slave-owner restoration forces. It will do us good to seriously sum up the experience of this period, especially the experience of the struggle waged by the Western Han Dynasty against the restorationist forces of Liu Pi, etc.

(I)

In the 12th year of his reign, the first Han Emperor, Liu Pang, made his nephew Liu Pi Prince of Wu, the latter expected to consolidate the southeastern half of the empire. However, he cautioned him: "People of the same surname belong to the same family. You must not betray me!" Piu Pi, then only twenty years of age, knelt down and knocked his head on the floor: "I dare not."* Yet, 40 years later, Liu Pi established himself as the chief representative of the slave-owner restorationist forces when he started "the rebellions of the seven states including Wu and Ch'u" in an attempt to subvert the state power of the newly arising landlord class.

The degeneration of Liu Pi from a member of the newly arising landlord class into a representative of the slave-owner restorationist forces was by no means an accidental occurrence. It had a profound social and class basis, that is, remnants and traces of the slave system still existed to a serious extent from economic base to superstructure in the early Western Han period.

After a new social system comes into being, the remnants or traces of the old system will certainly be hanging around for a considerable period of time. The replacement of the slave system by the feudal system was a change from one system of exploitation to another. It was impossible and unnecessary for the feudal landlord class to eradicate the remnants of the old system thoroughly. Quite the contrary, it could and must use certain forms of exploitation practiced during the slave order as a supplement and utilize certain factors of the superstructure of the slave system to serve

---

* "Liu Pi, Prince of Wu, Historical Records."

its own purposes. Within the landlord class there were people who degenerated into political representatives of the slave-owner restorationist forces. Therefore, so long as the remnants of the slave system still constituted a serious threat, restorationist activities by the new and old slave-owner forces were unavoidable in feudal society.

In the early years of Han, the overthrown slave-owner class, the industrial and commercial slave-owners in particular, still retained rather great economic power. During the Warring States period, the newly arising landlord class had not thoroughly destroyed the slave relations of production in the industrial and commercial sectors. And after Ch'in Shih Huang unified China, although measures were taken to control a part of big industrial and commercial slave-owners who were forced to move and settle elsewhere, he had not completely eradicated their economic influence. When the big industrial and commercial slave-owners moved to new places, they still carried on their trade and arose anew, with some "becoming so rich that they have a thousand servants" and "living a luxurious life like rulers."* Following its establishment, the Han Dynasty had adopted the policy of "stressing agriculture and restricting commerce," such as forbidding merchants to wear clothes of silk and ride on carriages, imposing double taxation on them, and preventing them from joining government service. But these were superficial measures failing to bring about a radical change in the slave relations of production in industry and commerce. Moreover, during the early period of Han people were allowed to smelt iron and prepare salt, and at one time were even allowed to mint coins. The use of slave labor was therefore very commonplace, much to the advantage of the industrial and commercial slave-owners. During the reigns of Emperors Wen and Ching, active in society were a large number of big salt and iron merchants, hoarders, minters and usurers. The industrial and commercial slave-owners, though seemingly restricted and discriminated against by law, were actually spared any blow in the relations of production, and remained as powerful. Among these vampires, "men did not plow and women did not weave. They lived a luxurious life." Ruthlessly, they "annexed the land holdings of peasants," forcing the peasants to "sell their land and houses as well as their children" and eventually become slaves. As Ch'ao Ts'o said: "Although the law of today holds merchants in contempt, they have nevertheless become very wealthy. The law favors the peasants, but they have become impoverished."**

Meanwhile, "although the old social system has vanished, its ideas in people's minds cannot be exterminated overnight, and there are many who hanker after the past." (Lenin, "Conference of the Petrograd Soviet") At that time, some Confucian disciples went about among the princes to preach "benevolence and justice," "rule by propriety," and "continuing the line of succession." The doctrines of Confucius and Mencius precisely served as the spiritual pillar and an ideological weapon for those nostalgic about the past.

---

* "The Money-makers, Historical Records."

** "Treatise of Agriculture, History of Han."

The existence of the remnants of the slave system and of the influence of the slave-owner class constituted the social and ideological root-causes for the degeneration of Liu Pi and other new aristocrats into political representatives of the slave-owner restorationist forces.

However, there was another important condition under which princes represented by Liu Pi became the political representatives of the slave-owner restorationist forces, and that was that part of the right of vassalage still existed under the feudal political structure of the newly emerging landlord class during the early Han period.

Vassalage was an important political institution in slave society in the history of our country. It combined with the Chingt'ien and the hereditary systems to protect the economic and political privileges of the slave-owner aristocracy. With the rise of the newly emerging landlord class, the Chingt'ien and hereditary systems of the slave order were negated, followed by the abolition of vassalage and the establishment of the prefecture and county system. The fact that Ch'in Shih Huang divided the country into 36 prefectures without installing a prince contributed immensely to strengthening the centralization of power and the consolidation of the dictatorship of the landlord class. However, history always advances in twists and turns. In early Han, Liu Pang, forced by prevailing circumstances, and "learning the lessons of the fall of Ch'in due to isolation,"* wrongly summed up the historical lessons of Ch'in's fall, and, influenced by traditional concepts, conferred the title of prince on a group of persons sharing the same family name with him while practicing the prefectural and county system, hoping thus to use the blood relationship to consolidate the state power of the newly emerging landlord class. At that time, Liu Pang thought that these measures--setting up prefectures and principalities at the same time--would bring him security of the country,"** without realizing that it was precisely these princes with the same family name and regarded as "rocks" of his rule who would disturb the Han empire.

To be sure, vassalage as practiced by early Han was no more than re-distribution of property and power within the landlord class itself, and greatly differed from that practiced during Western Chou. It did not change the feudal land ownership, the power of the princes was restricted in various ways, and premiers and counsellors of the vassal states were appointed by the central government, which also undertook the formulation of laws and disposition of troops. However, vassalage was after all "a spill-over from Chou,"*** retaining deep traces of the slave system, with the princes still having great prerogatives. The large principalities "covered prefectures

---

* "A List of Princes, History of Han."

** "Chronicles of Emperor Wen, History of Han."

*** Wang Fu-chih, "Han Emperor Wu," Read the General Outline History, Vol. III.

across the boundaries of chous and dozens of cities, having palaces and a court of officials conducted in a way similar to that in the national capital."* As prince of Wu, Liu Pi alone ruled over three prefectures and 53 cities. They held all the political and economic powers inside the vassal states, having the authority to appoint and dismiss officials below the rank of imperial censors, to collect taxes, and to mint coins. Moreover, the Han Dynasty had no written rules prohibiting princes from developing their own military forces. In this way, an institutional loophole was left open for the princes to expand. These vassal states were in every respect "independent kingdoms" without control by the central government.

In order to enlarge the privileges of vassalage, the princes desperately developed their own economic forces. Liu Pi, prince of Wu, was such a typical example. By exploiting the vassalage privileges and controlling vast natural resources, he gathered large numbers of deserters to practice slave exploitation, including the mining of copper, the minting of coins, the smelting of iron and the preparing of salt, becoming "far richer than the Son of Heaven."** He also protected the industrial and commercial slave-owners, and "sly and tricky persons to the east of the mountain gathered in Wu."+ Those slave-owners engaged in industry and commerce and "evil merchants" flocked to Wu like flies attracted to dirt and the slave economy was greatly developed. The state of Wu under Liu Pi became a base for maintaining and developing the slave economy.

If there was any sincerity in what Liu Pi, who came from the landlord class, said about "not daring" to rebel when he was made a prince, he later changed his political stand, and after the economic strength of the restorationist forces reached a certain point, he would engineer political usurpation of power and a restoration. By then, people like Liu Pi would try to have their political privileges extended through legal and illegal channels in order to suit their vested and potential economic interests. According to the Han system, the principalities must execute the laws and orders of the central government. But they "did not do so."++ One example was Liu Ch'ang, prince of Huainan. He "abolished the laws of the early emperors, ignored the edicts of the Son of Heaven, lived extravagantly as if he were the emperor himself. He made his own laws."+++ According to the Han system, again, the prime ministers of the princely states were to be appointed by the central government. However, the princes looked upon those high officials from the central government as people who would

---

* "A List of Princes, History of Han."

** "On P'ing Huai, Historical Records."

\+ "Wealth, On Salt and Iron."

++ "Chia I, History of Han."

+++ "Huainan and Hengshan, Historical Records."

stand in their way, and some simply sent these appointed officials away and appointed their own prime ministers. For instance, Liu Ch'ang, prince of Huainan, on his authority made "his own secretary prime minister."* Others even had the prime ministers and counselors appointed by the central government put to death. This was what Liu Wu, prince of Ch'u, did. He killed "prime minister Chang Shang and Counsellor Chao I-wu" because both of them opposed his evil deeds.** Some even bought their loyalty with money. For instance, the prime minister of Wu, Yüan Ang, was bought off by Liu Pi, prince of Wu. "Yüan was bribed and said not a word against the Prince."*** He later became Liu Pi's agent in the central government. The Han system ruled that military power should be controlled by the central government. But the princes defiantly organized and expanded their own reactionary armies. Liu Pi had been expanding his military forces for a long time, "building money reserves, training more troops and storing grain for more than 30 years."+

In addition, these princes were opposed to the Legalist line pursued by the central court since the time of the first emperor of Han, and recruited large numbers of reactionary Confucian scholars to worship and observe the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius. "Among the princes at that time, some were keen on cultivating an intelligentsia and developing literature and arts. Prominent among them were the princes of Ch'u, Wu, Liang, Huainan and Hochien."++ The prince of Huainan gathered around him several thousand "Confucianists from everywhere," and asked them to write books charging that "Shang Yang's laws brought about the fall of Ch'in"+++, slanderously saying that "Ch'in perished because it wanted to swallow the whole world."# They attacked the Legalist line as "violence beyond reason"## and advocated that "the foundation of rule is benevolence and righteousness; and its collapse is caused by laws and measures."### They opposed the dictatorship of the newly emerging landlord class by preaching the "benevolence and righteousness" doctrines of

---

* "Huainan and Hengshan, Historical Records."

** "King Yüan of Ch'u, History of Han."

*** "Yüan Ang and Ch'ao Ts'o, Historical Records."

\+ "Liu Pi, Historical Records."

++ Lu Hsün, "Outline History of Han Literature."

+++ "Instruction to T'ai Tsu, Huainan Tzu."

\# "Instruction to Men, Huainan Tzu."

"Instruction to Shu Chen, Huainan Tzu."

"Instruction to T'ai Tsu, Huainan Tzu."

Confucius and Mencius. Liu Pi also "recruited wandering scholars from everywhere,"* and used these disciples of Confucius and Mencius to create public opinion in favor of usurpation of power and restoring the old order.

In this way, relying on vassalage privileges, Liu Pi and other princes gradually expanded their reactionary economic and political forces and became representatives of the slave-owner restoration factions.

(II)

As the slave-owner restorationist forces developed to a certain stage, their representatives would ask to usurp the power of the central government, overthrow the feudal country and openly restore the slave system in an all-round manner. This constituted a primary cause of many revolts by princes during the first few decades of the Han Dynasty, as typically exemplified by the "rebellion of the seven states including Wu and Ch'u" started by Liu Pi in 154 B.C.

Liu Pi's rebellion was a programmatic, organized, planned and systematic restoration action taken by the slave-owner forces to usurp power; it was a long premeditated reactionary action. In his sinister letter to other princes of the same family name who joined in the scheme, Liu Pi made it clear that the purpose of his armed revolt was to "preserve and continue the line of succession, strengthen the weak and attack the strong and ruthless."** This is a good self-explanation of his reactionary program. The so-called "preservation" referred to the already overthrown slave-owner class and slave system; the so-called "weak" referred to the slave-owner restorationist forces he represented; and "strong and ruthless" referred to the central government of the landlord class keeping to the Legalist line. Here Liu Pi clearly revealed the political aim, class essence and social basis of their rebellion.

During the early period of Western Han, although the overthrown slave-owner class, as mentioned above, still retained considerable economic strength in industry and commerce, they were unlike the former aristocrat slave-owners in that they had neither political power and status nor military strength and readiness. Conceivably it was impossible for them to act alone in restoring the old order. To recover their lost "paradise" they must search for political agents, to "use their wealth to make friends with the princes."*** The princes, being economically "weak," had to rely on direct or indirect support of the industrial and commercial slave-owners if they were to realize their counter-revolutionary ambitions. These two groups of people--one consisting of surviving slave-owners and the other of

---

* "Tsou Yang, History of Han."

** "Liu Pi, Historical Records."

*** "Treatise of Agriculture, History of Han."

new aristocrats who wanted to develop their privileges characteristic of the slave system--shared a common fate and harbored the same ambitions in a society of dictatorship of the landlord class. Attracted to each other, they lost no time in acting together. Liu Pi said, "I can obtain money everywhere under Heaven, not necessarily from Wu--so much money, in fact, that it cannot be spent by all princes."* This sufficed to reveal the secret behind the collusion among these slave-owner restoration forces in conducting reactionary activities.

The princes also colluded with the Hun slave-owner aristocrats. When the "rebellion of the seven states including Wu and Ch'u" broke out, Liu Pi publicly declared: "The princes of Yen and Chao have an agreement with the prince of Hu /the barbarians/" in what was intended as a move to lead the army of the Hun slave-owner aristocrats "into the Kansu pass and march head-on to Changan to correct the behavior of the Son of Heaven."**

While marshalling these restorationist forces, Liu Pi became ever more ambitious. From the outset, he "grumbled" about the Han royal court, and then "absented himself from attending court by taking sick leave" and "plotted a revolt." On hearing that the "Han court ministers were discussing the proposal to reduce the territory of Wu," he immediately sent a secret envoy to see the various princes with a proposal to form an alliance with them so as to "come to each other's rescue when attacked and to share benefits." Moreover, he made use of such natural phenomena as "the appearance of a comet and locusts" to pass around the absurdity of interaction between Heaven and man and thus agitate for rebellion. When he felt that his secret envoy might not be reliable, he went to see the other princes himself despite his old age, exposing his anxiety and impatience. When the rebellion started, he shouted: "He who kills a Han official shall be rewarded with 2,000 piculs of grain."*** He forced all people over 14 and under 62 to enter into military service. He "secretly conspired to join his forces with those of the Huns and other border tribes." Wherever the rebellious troops went, they "robbed the people," "killed the innocent and burned people's houses."+ Both the social economy and the livelihood of the people suffered tremendously. As to those industrial and commercial slave-owners who made frequent "visits to the princes and provided them with funds,"++ they had by then become "fearless and acted as bullies everywhere."+++ Likewise, those travelling Confucian scholars

---

* "Liu Pi, Historical Records."

** Ibid.

*** Ibid.

\+ Ibid.

++ "The Money-Makers-Justice, Historical Records."

+++ Wang Fu-chih, op. cit.

then curled up and extended, congratulating each other, throwing their hats in the air. They could not be more boisterous.

Liu Pi, this representative of the slave-owner restorationist forces, was not only a careerist but also a conspirator and double dealer. It was he who, hanging out the signboard of "stabilizing the rule of Lius," invented the notorious tactic of "clearing evil men from the Emperor's sides." He attacked Ch'ao Ts'o in order to conceal his own reactionary aim, and opposed the line of the central government under the pretext of supporting the central government. In a similar manner, he scuttled the Legalist leadership group under the pretext of protecting the "flesh and blood of the Lius." This counter-revolutionary tactic was copied many times later by conspirators engaged in usurping power, restoring the old order, creating a split, and selling out the country. It was in fact "highly treasured by many careerists."

Although Liu Pi for a time got away with his tactic of "clearing evil men from the Emperor's side," and Ch'ao Ts'o was murdered, this was no more than a figleaf that could not conceal his ambition to be "emperor of the east." After seeing through Liu Pi's conspiracy, Emperor Ching could not care about "the flesh and blood" principle and issued an imperial edict enumerating Liu Pi's crimes and ordering his generals and soldiers at the front to launch a resolute counter-attack against him.

Liu Pi and others had little support, being in the wrong. Despite the fact that he had engaged in machinations for over 30 years and had gathered several hundred thousand men, beaming with self-confidence, yet once he started the rebellion, he "fell" instantly, being unable to "preserve and continue the line of succession," and finally ended up ignominiously, his head severed from his body.

(III)

During the early period of Western Han, the newly emerging landlord class had taken a detour in its struggle against the new aristocrats who degenerated into representatives of the slave-owner restorationist forces. Representatives of the Legalist school in their struggle to consolidate the dictatorship of the newly emerging landlord class never stopped summing up the positive and negative experiences and gradually came to understand the necessity of restricting and exterminating such new aristocracy. Accordingly, they gradually found ways and means to restrain and attack them, thereby unceasingly enriching the Legalist line.

At that time, the principal tasks of consolidating the dictatorship of the newly emerging landlord class were as follows: extinguish the revolts of the princes and restrict their privileges, destroy the economic foundation of the slave-owner restorationist forces, and resist and attack the invading Hun slave-owner aristocrats. To restrict or to extend the vassalage privileges was the focal point of the struggle at that time. It was because the economic foundation of the restorationist forces in these places could be further crushed only when the "independent kingdoms" of the princes were destroyed. At the same time, only by consolidating the dictatorship of the newly emerging landlord class holding centralized power would it be possible to defeat the Hun slave-owner aggressors.

The Legalist Chia I was the first to perceive the danger resulting from the expanding influence of princes sharing the surname of Liu. In his memorial entitled "Security Policy" to Emperor Wen, he vigorously called for attention to the serious threat posed by the princes. As he saw it, the prevailing situation at that time was so critical that it was like a man lying over a pile of faggots about to be set ablaze. He warned: "Those who are distant to you pose a threat, while those who are close to you will certainly rebel." If the princes were powerful, no matter how their relations with the Han royal house were, they would surely revolt. Proceeding from this basic viewpoint, he proposed the tactic of "increasing the number of principalities but giving them less power."* The proposal put forward by Ch'ao Ts'o to Emperor Ching to "reduce the territories of the vassal states" called for special attention to be paid to Liu Pi, the No. 1 representative of the slave-owner restorationist forces. He pointed out: "If you reduce their territories, they will rebel; if you do not, they will rebel just the same. Reduce their territories, and they will be weak and cannot cause great harm. If you do not, they will be strong and will cause great harm."** He energetically called for weakening the princes and strengthening central power. However, both Chia I and Ch'ao Ts'o restricted their vision to the reduction of the territories of the princes without perceiving that the vassalage privileges constituted an essential problem--the remnants of the old system.

The "rebellion of the seven states including Wu and Ch'u" headed by Liu Pi was a deep lesson to the newly emerging landlord class. After crushing the rebellion, Emperor Ching made the decision to give the princes territories but not the right to govern them. The administrative affairs of these principalities were to be run by officials appointed by the central government, thereby further restricting the vassalage privileges. This was a heavy blow to the new aristocrats who represented the restoration forces, and was a major victory for the Legalist line, an inexorable result of class struggle. The Confucian Su Che of the Sung Dynasty brazenly criticized Emperor Ching's policy of weakening the princes as one of "intolerance," while referring to Emperor Wen as a humble gentleman who "was tolerant and did not weaken the princes."*** This was utter nonsense from the mouth of a Confucian.

On the basis of Emperor Ching's reduction of vassal territories, Emperor Wu, besides resolutely suppressing the prince of Huainan Liu An and others who were plotting a rebellion, took a series of important measures. He adopted the "favor extending" method, which stipulated that while the eldest sone of a prince should succeed to the title, his other children should also get a share of the land -- such land to be "incorporated into

---

* "Chia I, History of Han."

** "Liu Pi, Historical Records."

*** "Han Emperor Wen," Collection of Luanch'eng, Vol. VII.

Han prefectures."* Nominally it was the Emperor who granted the favors, but actually it was a "divide and rule"** policy. Once, he had the titles of 106 princes abolished on the grounds that the gold they offered as tribute for ritual purposes did not come up to standard. On top of all this, he drew up a whole set of strict laws which greatly limited the power of the princes both politically and economically. Prolonged struggle finally put an end to the phase marked by rival principalities since early Han.

To further consolidate the dictatorship of the newly emerging landlord class it was also imperative to introduce economic reforms before the restorationist forces of the slave-owners could be completely eradicated.

Both Chia I and Ch'ao Ts'o saw the danger posed by the industrial and commercial slave-owners, and advocated a policy of "stressing agriculture and restraining commerce" in order to develop the feudal landlord economy while restricting the industrial and commercial slave-owners. As Chia I saw it, the abandonment of agriculture in favor of industry and trade had adversely affected agricultural production. So he proposed that minting, mining and smelting be put under the unified control of the central government, so that the people would "return to agriculture as the foundation of the economy"+ so as to consolidate central power economically. Ch'ao Ts'o went even further as he accused the industrial and commercial slave-owners of disrupting agriculture in collusion with the princes. He exposed the crimes of Liu Pi in "amassing a fortune from mining and minting and production of salt from sea water and inducing the lawless in the world to join him in rebellion."++

Emperor Wu saw more clearly the importance of carrying out economic reforms. On the basis of proposals submitted by the Legalist Sang Hung-yang and others, he made a decisive move to nationalize such important industries as minting, iron smelting and salt production that had been monopolized by the princes and industrial and commercial slave-owners. By setting up offices to fix prices and insure balanced supply of goods, the Han government was able to "control all goods produced in the country." At the same time, by rewarding people who reported on wealthy merchants evading taxes, he dealt serious blows to the latter. At that time, a large number of average and higher class industrial and commercial slave-owners went bankrupt, with the government confiscating "large amounts of property, tens of thousands of slave-servants and farms."+++ These measures strengthened the economic

---

* "The 13 Princes of Ching, History of Han."

** "A List of Princes, History of Han."

\+ "Treatise of Agriculture, History of Han."

++ "Liu Pi, Historical Records."

+++ "On P'ing Huai, Historical Records."

strength of the dictatorship of the landlord class and effectively destroyed the material basis of the princes and industrial-commercial slave-owners to usurp power and stage a comeback. As Sang Hung-yang stated: "These measures did not aim purely at increasing national income, they were intended to build up the most essential and restrain the least essential, break up conspiracies, and close the road to annexation,"* and "therefore they made the princes work in favor of the central government."**

Owing to restrictions imposed on vassalage privileges and the introduction of economic reforms, the central government of the state under the dictatorship of the landlord class during West Han became unprecedentedly solid and strong by the time Emperor Wu, Liu Ch'e, took the reins, and basically solved the crisis of the restoration of the slave system.

However, the replacement of the slave system by the feudal system was but that of one system of exploitation by another. What the feudal landlord class could do was at best to abolish more or less the privileges featuring the slave system and to protect the privileges identified with the feudal system in various ways. In subsequent development of history, as the feudal relations of production became increasingly backward and reactionary, feudal privileges also became historical obstacles that had to be abolished.

* * *

---

* "Restoration of the Old, On Salt and Iron."

** "Exertion at Farming, On Salt and Iron."

Yesterday and Today

by

Shih Hsing (史星)

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 2, April 20, 1975)

Most people may remember the notorious remark made by the slave comprador Hu Shih: History is like an exceedingly docile and helpless little girl who could be made up in whatever way one pleases. A preposterous theory of historical idealism has now been picked up by Moscow for a grand show! If you don't believe it, all you have to do is to pick up at random a few Soviet revisionist "historical works" published today and briefly compare them with the historical works published in the Soviet Union yesterday, and you'll know why.

Let's take a look at the book-stands in Moscow. There in some historical works bandits of Tsarist Russian aggression negated in past Soviet historical works have now stood up again one by one to be admired and saluted. One of them was Khabarov, a butcher whose hands were stained with the blood of the Chinese people.

Who was Khabarov? He was none other than the commander of the Tsarist Russian aggressive army that intruded into Chinese territory along the Heilung River in the middle of the 17th century. Definitive conclusions about this man were found in yesterday's Soviet historical works. It was clearly indicated in the 1935 edition of the "Soviet Grand Encyclopedia": Khabarov was "the disseminator of the aggressive plan of Tsarist Russia's Far Eastern colonial policy." When he led a Tsarist Russian aggressive army "to march into the peaceful region of Tahur, they brutally slaughtered the residents, plundered the region, reduced cities to ruins, and caused farms to be abandoned. The residents were filled with panic and fled." The local Chinese people many times rose to resist, and were "ruthlessly suppressed by Khabarov."* The historian Bakluzin (巴赫鲁申) made a documented exposure of Khabarov's crimes in a book "Cossacks on the Heilung River": In China's Heilung River region, wherever they (referring to the Khabarov gang) went, they did everything from rape to plunder. On occupying a town, they used to kill all men taken prisoner and took over their wives and children. During the invasion and occupation of Much'eng of the Tahurs in June 1651 alone, they killed 661 male prisoners and took away 243 women and 118 children.** Onetime winner of the Soviet History Textbook Award, Shestakov (谢斯塔柯夫) wrote in the "Concise Course of the History of

---

* "Soviet Grand Encyclopedia," 1935 edition.

** C.B. Bakluzin, "Cossacks on the Heilung River," 1925 Leningrad edition.

the Soviet Union" which he edited: Khabarov "burned to the ground all villages that resisted him."* Edited by Panklatova (潘克拉托娃), "A General History of the Soviet Union" also stated: Khabarov and his troops occupied the Amur River region for three years, burning houses, killing the inhabitants, and capturing prisoners."** Please look, wasn't the aggressor image of Khabarov fixed long ago?

But in "historical works" published by the Soviet revisionists, this butcher was "exonerated." What's more, he is even regarded as a Soviet "hero." For example, the comment on Khabarov given in the 1960 edition of the "Concise Soviet Encyclopedia" reversed the verdict recorded in the 1935 edition of the "Soviet Grand Encyclopedia." "The disseminator of the aggressive plan of the Tsarist Russian Far Eastern colonial policy" became "a Russian new land discoverer;" the burning, killing and looting on Chinese land was described as "completing" an "important phase in the history of study in the Amur River valley."*** Similar examples can be found in "On the History of Formation of the Russo-Chinese Boundaries" written by the Soviet revisionist "scholar" diplomat Tikhvinskiy and others. There Khabarov was exhalted and referred to as "a famous traveller -- a discoverer of new land,"+ the "Columbus" of Russia,++ "a man of extraordinary courage,"+++ "a minister of merit" who had the "region along the Amur" "formally incorporated into Russia."+

In historical research, following new discoveries in historical data, as historical development itself pushes formerly obscure historical factors to the fore, and especially as the torrents of the practice of proletarian revolution continually washes away the dirty water used by the landlord class and the bourgeoisie to cover up historical facts,

---

* Shestakov, "Concise Course of the History of the Soviet Union," published by the House of Writers, 1951 Chinese translation, p. 63.

** Edited by Panklatova, "A General History of the Soviet Union," Vol. I, 1955 edition published by Moscow Foreign Languages Publication Bureau, p. 254.

*** Edited by Fuwikinskiy (符维金斯基), "Concise Soviet Encyclopedia," 1960 Russian Third Edition, Vol. IX, p. 1201.

\+ Tikhvinskiy and others, "On the History of Formation of Russo-Chinese Boundaries," Soviet "International Life, 1972 No. 6 issue.

++ Okladnikov (奥克拉德尼科夫), "The Far Eastern Region of the Soviet Union As Seen from the Latest Archaeological Findings," Soviet "Historical Problems," 1964 No. 1 issue.

+++ Trifennov (特利丰诺夫), "The Seashore Is Our Boundary," Soviet "New Time," 1972 No. 43 issue.

people's knowledge and understanding of history will certainly continue to deepen. For us today to modify the viewpoint of yesterday is permissible and normal, and to uphold the truth and correct the errors is what every serious historical work must do. But what is happening currently in the Soviet revisionist historical circles is quite a different thing, absolutely having nothing to do with the progressive movement in historical science. It is an act of regression in every respect, a mere academic reflection of political restoration. Praises showered on bandits of aggression in today's "historical works" published by the Soviet revisionists are not a new invention, but old tunes of the Tsarist era replayed. The 1904 Petersburg edition of the "Encyclopedic Dictionary" noted: The Tsar, in commending Khabarov for his "distinguished service" in "conquering the land along the Amur River," conferred on him the title of "son of the nobility."* Is the Khabarov portrayed in the "historical works" currently published by the Soviet revisionists not the same Khabarov noted in the "Encyclopedic Dictionary" of the Tsarist era? The old Tsars viewed the aggressor chief Khabarov as a valuable teaching material in educating their offspring to inherit the aggressive cause. No wonder that "Encyclopedic Dictionary" went to great lengths to laud the "distinguished services" of Khabarov and his like. Today, the new Tsars are following in the footsteps of the old Tsars, and in their "historical works," they have again brought out Khabarov as valuable teaching material garbed in the Moscow fashion,and cried aloud, "Let future generations forever remember him."** This sounds all very logical of course.

In the various "historical works" produced by the Soviet revisionists, since bandits can become "heroes," naturally the aggressor may turn into "a victim of aggression," and land seized from another country can be described as "land lost," so it seems they may "recover the lost land." As Lenin, when exposing opportunism, pointed out: "What has been said may be forgotten, principles may be lost, the world outlook may be discarded, and resolutions and solemn promises may be brushed aside--it is not at all strange that such things may happen today." ("Preface Written for Bukharin's Pamphlet 'World Economy and Imperialism'.") In this regard, what is more interesting than their statements on the Sino-Russian boundary agreements?

Let us start with the "Nipuchu /Nerchinsk/ Treaty," the first treaty of its kind ever signed between China and Russia. Yesterday's Soviet historical works dealt with this treaty in the following way:

---

* Edited by Andreyevskiy (安德烈耶夫斯基) and others, "Encyclopedic Dictionary," Vol. XXXVIA, 1904 St. Petersburg edition, p. 947.

** Pastohov (帕斯图霍夫), "Cruise Along the Amur River," "Pravda," August 21, 1970.

In 1941, "History of World Diplomacy" edited by the Soviet historian and academician Bochomkin (鮑壽姆金), who was formerly a member of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party and had been the First Deputy People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, stated: "The 'Nipuchu Treaty' signed in 1689 was essentially a great diplomatic victory for Moscow." "Sino-Russian relations up to the mid-19th century were built on the foundation of the 'Nipuchu Treaty'."*

"A History of International Relations in the Far East" published in 1956 and edited by academician Rukov (茹科夫), reputedly an expert on modern international relations and problems of colonialism, was a book said to have "systematically explained the reactionary policies of imperialist countries against the people of various countries in the Far East."** It declared explicitly: "The 1689 Treaty (i.e., the 'Nipuchu Treaty') was an equal treaty."*** "The Nipuchu Treaty was of vital significance. It consolidated the peaceful neighborly relations between China and Russia" and "helped safeguard Russian positions in the Far East."+

In 1960, "Russian-Chinese Relations in the 17th Century" written by Shepinkov (舍宾科夫) and published by the publishing house of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, had this to say: "The 1689 'Nipuchu Treaty' was the first equal treaty concluded between Russia and China." "It was based on the principle of equality and mutual benefit."++

Even by 1961, in the "Dictionary on Diplomacy" edited by Gromyko, currently a member of the Political Bureau of the Soviet revisionists and Foreign Minister, it was admitted that the "Nipuchu Treaty" "has helped stop border disputes between Russia and China and opened up possibilities of developing the mutual peaceful relations between the two countries."+++

---

* Bochomkin, "History of World Diplomacy," Part I, 1950 2nd edition of the Fifties Publishing House, p. 215.

** Rukov, "A History of International Relations in the Far East," 1959 edition of World Knowledge Publishing House, p. 2.

*** Ibid., p. 39, Footnote 2.

\+ Ibid., pp. 30-40.

++ Shepinkov, "Russian-Chinese Relations in the 17th Century," 1960 edition, pp. 208, 219.

+++ Edited by Gromyko and others, "Dictionary on Diplomacy," Vol. II, 1961 Moscow edition, p. 404.

But today, in order to establish the "rationality" behind the large stretches of Chinese territory occupied by Tsarist Russia during the two opium wars, these conclusions conforming to historical facts have long been cast to the winds and replaced by completely different assertions. Here we still have the works by Rukov and Gromyko as examples. In the recent new edition of Rukov's "A History of International Relations in the Far East," the sentence "The 1689 Treaty was an equal treaty" in the old edition has been deleted and replaced by the sentence "The Nipuchu Treaty was forced on Russia by all kinds of threats and preceded by the use of a large number of Ch'ing troops to illegally occupy Russian territory."* "It consolidated the peaceful neighborly relations between China and Russia" has also been replaced by the line "(China) through the Nipuchu Treaty has long seized from Russia the region along the Amur River."* As to Gromyko, editor of "Dictionary on Diplomacy," he has taken the pains of slapping his own face by condemning what he had said yesterday as "rumor that came out of the void." In its 1971 edition, "Dictionary on Diplomacy" describes the Nipuchu Treaty, which in the old edition "has opened up possibilities in developing mutual peaceful relations between the two countries," as a "very imperfect document." Yesterday they proclaimed the treaty as one which "helped stop border disputes between Russia and China," today they say that "the Russian Government has reason to ask for a revision of the boundary."**

If the Nipuchu Treaty, regarded as an equal treaty yesterday, could suddenly become an "unequal treaty" today, then a series of publicly acknowledged unequal treaties signed between China and Russia in the wake of Tsarist aggression after 1840 could also suddenly become "equal treaties." Such is the case with the "historical works" published by the Soviet revisionists today.

As far back as the 1920's, the "Concise Soviet Encyclopedia" had made clear that in the "Aigun Treaty" of 1858, "(China) ceded to Russia the left bank of the Amur (from the Argun River to the Pacific). The "Aigun Treaty" was the first step taken by Tsarist Russia in invading and occupying Chinese Territory."***

In the 1930's, the "History of the Civil War in the Soviet Union" disclosed unmistakably: "In the 16th-17th centuries, Russia's Tsarist

---

* Edited by Rukov, "International Relations in the Far East," 1973 edition of Moscow "Ideology" Press, p. 32.

** Edited by Gromyko and others, "Dictionary on Diplomacy," Part II, 1971 Moscow edition.

*** Edited by Masheliakov (麥舍里亞科夫), "Concise Soviet Encyclopedia," Vol. I, 1929 first edition, p. 174.

system, reflecting the interests of the ruling class, initiated extensive military expeditions toward the east. In mid-19th century, Alexander II seized from China the areas along the Heilung and Wusuli Rivers."*

In the 1940's, "A General History of the Soviet Union" (Vol. II) edited by Panklatova and issued throughout the country as a textbook for secondary schools, said: The "Aigun Treaty" made China "cede to Tsarist Russia territory on the left bank of the Amur River." "In the winter of 1860, the 'Aigun Treaty' was confirmed in the 'Peking Treaty' and ceded to Tsarist Russia vast regions between the Wusuli River and the Pacific."**

In 1952, "Modern Histories of Eastern Countries" edited and written jointly by the Oriental History Division of the Department of History at Moscow University and the Oriental Study Institute at the Soviet Academy of Sciences also took the view: in the hundred or two hundred years beginning with the signing of the "Nipuchu Treaty," Tsarist Russia "maintained diplomatic and trade relations with China on the basis of equality," but from mid-19th century onward, with the signing of such treaties as the "Aigun Treaty," Tsarist Russia "ganged up with the capitalist powers which bound China with unequal treaties."+

By 1959, the self-styled "Marxist historical work,"++ "A General History of the World" (Vol. VI) edited by the Soviet Academy of Sciences, still admitted: "These two treaties are evidence that the Tsarist Government colluded with Britain, France and the United States in carrying out a policy of aggression in China."+++

Although Soviet historial works of yesterday reflected a number of historical facts when dealing with these three treaties, yet as Lenin,

---

* Edited by Gorky, Voroshilov (伏罗希洛夫), Girov (基洛夫), Jidanov (日丹諾夫) and Stalin, "History of the Civil War in the Soviet Union," 1936 edition, Vol. I, chapter I, section 4.

** Edited by Panklatova (潘克拉托娃), "General History of the Soviet Union," 1955 edition of Moscow Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 207.

\+ Edited by Rasinir (雷斯涅尔), "Modern Histories of Eastern Countries," 1957 edition of Sanlien Bookstore, p. 585.

++ Edited by the Soviet Academy of Sciences, "A General History of the World," Vol. 1, "Note by General Editorial Department," 1959 edition of Sanlien Bookstore, p. 1.

+++ Edited by the Soviet Academy of Sciences, "A General History of the World," Vol. VI, 1965 edition of Sanlien Bookstore, p. 570.

citing a maxim, said, "if geometrical principles undermine people's interests, they too would be overthrown." ("Marxism and Revisionism") The historical conclusions of yesterday have obviously hurt the interests of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism and are an obstacle to the aggressive expansion of the new Tsars, so they too must be "overthrown." Therefore, in today's Soviet revisionist "historical works" history has been completely stood on its head. In the "great work," "On the History of Formation of the Russo-Chinese Border," Tikhvinskiy and others go so far as to say: "The Ch'ing Empire occupied large tracts of land along the Amur River according to the treaty of 1689, but according to the treaties of 1858 and 1860 it was forced to return a large portion of the occupied territory."* "A Collection of Documents on Russian-Chinese Relations in the 17th Century" edited by this piper "scholar" of the new Tsars, has gone to greater length in confusing black and white. It states absurdly that the occupation of Chinese territory by Russia "was not the result of military action or armed threat," but a winding up of the efforts of the Tsarist Government in "recovering" territory that had been incorporated into Russia since the early 17th century. Its conclusion is thus: "Russia had neither invaded China nor occupied its territory."** Please note that what Tikhvinskiy has said is that in the eyes of the new Tsars, the million or so square kilometers of Chinese territory seized by the old Tsars were merely "a large portion" of lost land "recovered." And what would make a total "recovery"? Taking away the whole of China's northeast? "Recovering" all the territory of China's north extending to the foot of the Great Wall? What a big appetite!

Precisely for the purpose of satisfying an appetite greater than that of the old Tsars, the Soviet revisionist "historical works" today not only engage in a wilful play of words over historical material, but also wantonly use archaeological findings as a tool to push their aggressive policies. The so-called historical research in the Soviet Union today is best illustrated by the performance of a so-called "archaeologist and historian," the academician Okladenikov, head of the Historical Linguistics and Philosophy Institute of the Siberian branch of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. It shows that the minimum scientific attitude has been lost. In 1959, this academician published a special work entitled "The Distant Past of Seashore Regions," in which he proved by archaeological discoveries that as far back as the age of antiquity before there was recorded history, the Heilung River and Yellow River basins had already formed a unified cultural entity. He proved with indisputable facts that the Chinese Government of the T'ang Dynasty had set up administrative organs there, and that the Government of the Ming Dynasty had "set up local administrative organs and despatched

---

* Tikhvinskiy and others, "On the History of Formation of Russian-Chinese Border," Soviet "International Life," 1972 No. 6 issue.

** Edited by Tikhvinskiy, "A Collection of Documents on Russian-Chinese Relations in the 17th Century," Vol. II, "Foreword."

officials there to collect annual tribute."* In particular, he mentioned the famous Nurkan Commandery set up by the Government of the Ming Dynasty. But he changed his tone immediately after Khrushchev publicly opposed China and communism, provoked border disputes and made territorial claims on China. In 1964, he wrote for the magazine "Soviet History" an article entitled "The Far East Region of the Soviet Union as Seen from Newest Archaeological Findings." With the same archaeological material he drew an entirely different conclusion: The culture of the Heilung River basin "did not originate from the Yellow River basin, it did not come from people of the Yang Shao (仰韶) culture." This area never belonged to the "Manchus" or to "China's north;" on the contrary, it had "inseparable ties" with "the history of other fraternal nationalities of the Soviet Union."** This is strange news indeed! Even going further, after the Brezhnev renegade clique flagrantly launched an armed attack on China's Chenpao /Tamanski/ island, this archaeologist had the novel idea--after making an examination of the ware patterns of the stone age in this region, the fashionable long dresses worn by the local women today and the structural design of club buildings of collective farms--of arriving at this conclusion: "Obviously, the whole artistic wealth did not originate from a faraway land, not from the Yellow River nor from ancient China."+ Where did it originate from? In his "New Archaeological Findings in the Far East," he states: It was not the Yang Shao culture of China's Yellow River basin that influenced the seashore regions of the Soviet Union today; on the contrary, it was from there that the Yang Shao culture "found its way to the Yellow River basin."++ In August 1974, this Mr. academician published a special work "People from Siberia," in which he once more announced a startling "discovery." According to his "verifications," the inhabitants of Siberia were formerly cultural teachers of the Chinese, and even the tradition of taking the dragon as a symbol was also brought to China from there.+++ Compared with this academician Okladnikov, the master manipulator of history Hu Shih would feel he had been bested.

In today's Soviet revisionist "historical works," such an urgent desire to alter yesterday's historical conclusions is certainly not an

---

* Okladnikov, "The Distant Past of Seashore Regions," 1959 Vladivostok Edition of the Soviet Seashore Publishing House, p. 288.

** Okladnikov, "The Far Eastern Regions of the Soviet Union as Seen from Latest Archaeological Findings," "Soviet History," 1964 No. 1 issue.

\+ "Where the Water of the Amur River Flows," "Pravada," March 26, 1969.

++ Okladnikov, "New Archaeological Discoveries in the Far East," Soviet "Far Eastern Problems," 1972 No. 3 issue.

+++ Oklandnikov, "People from Siberia," 1974 Vienna German edition. Quoted from "The Chinese Dragon Came from Siberia" carried in Austrian "Crown Daily," August 11, 1974.

isolated, partial phenomena, but reflects a universal, basic change. This change is determined by the nature of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism. Engels said most incisively: "The bourgeoisie has turned everything into commodities, and the same goes with historical study. The nature of the bourgeoisie and its very condition of survival requires it to forge all commodities and also to forge history. The highest rewards will be given to those historical works that forge history in a manner that suit the interests of the bourgeoisie best." ("Fragments of the 'History of Ireland'") In the Soviet Union today, the Brezhnev renegade clique has also turned historical study into a commodity in order to meet the needs of oppression and exploitation at home and expansion and aggression abroad. Among the "historical works" published by the Soviet revisionists today, those that forge history in a way best suited to the interests of social imperialism and the interests of the new Tsars for aggression and expansion have the highest commodity value. In order to fabricate history, they openly go against Marxism-Leninism. In the Soviet Union today, the so-called "Marxist historical works" are actually bourgeois pseudo scientific works completely betraying the Marxist-Leninist world outlook, a batch of totally anti-Marxist-Leninist poisonous weeds. Now, let us cite a few examples of how they have tampered with the brilliant Marxist-Leninist theses on the foreign policy of Tsarist Russia to see how the Soviet revisionists have degenerated!

Marx and Engels had revealed many times that Tsarist "Russia is undoubtedly a country with aggressive ambitions." (Engels, "The Bone of Contention in Turkey") "Its methods, its tactics, and its means may change, but the aim of this policy -- world hegemonism -- will never change." (Marx, "Speech at the London Meeting in Commemoration of the Polish Uprising, January 22, 1867") But the Soviet revisionist magazine "Modern and Contemporary History" declares brazenly: "The assertion that the objective of Tsarist Russia was world domination" is "without any proof." People "just arbitrarily put the aggressive design on Russia's head."*

Both Engels and Lenin had repeatedly pointed out that Tsarist Russia was the "world gendarme," and that "the Tsarist government was the main bastion of reactionary forces in the entire civilized world." ("Comment on the Tsar's European Tour and the Tour of Britain by Certain Representatives of the Black Gang in Duma") Lenin further pointed out that "there was a time in the past when the Tsarist monarchy was the gendarme of Europe as it not only protected the reactionaries in Russia but also assisted reactionaries who used violence to suppress all movements striving for freedom in Europe. Nicholas II took one step further: now the Tsar was not only the gendarme of Europe but also the gendarme of Asia. He attempted to suppress all freedom-striving movements in Turkey, Persia and China by means of conspiracy, money and the worst kind of violence." ("The Election Platform of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party") Today, the Soviet

---

* Soviet magazine "Modern and Contemporary History," 1973 No. 1 issue. Article by Astafeyev (阿斯塔菲耶夫) and Narochniskiy (纳罗奇尼茨基).

revisionist works that forge history say: "In the whole of world history prior to 1917, Russia was mistakenly pictured as a principal, almost the only aggressive force."* The Soviet revisionist magazine "Afro-Asian People" even openly opposes Lenin's scientific assertion about Tsarist Russia being the "gendarme of Asia" by uttering such nonsense as "to present Tsarist Russia as the 'gendarme of Asia'" is to whip up "anti-Russian sentiments."**

Exposing the crimes of Tsarist Russia in invading China, Marx pointed out explicitly: "It occupied the homeland of the current ruling nationality of China -- the land on both banks of the Heilung River." ("Russia's Trade with China") "Because of a recent treaty (meaning the Sino-Russian Aigun Treaty) Russia acquired a new piece of territory equal to the size of France, ...until then Russia had long desired to lay hands on this area. Tsars, from Alexi Michaelovich to Nicholai, had consistently attempted to occupy this region." ("Treaty between China and Britain") Engels, exposing Tsarist crimes in invading China in mid-19th century, pointed out: "While the naval and land forces of Britain and France were concentrating in the direction of Hong Kong, Cossack troops of the Siberian frontier command were slowly but steadily moving their barracks from the Tahur mountains to the banks of the Heilung River and Russian marines were building fortifications around the best harbors in Manchuria." ("Persia and China") During the Second Opium War, Russia, "apart from taking its share of all obvious benefits obtained by Britain and France, acquired the region along the Heilung River, a region it occupied stealthily. Yet Russia was not satisfied with this. It has already done its best to set up a Sino-Russian committee to determine the boundary, and we know what such a committee will look like in Russian hands." ("Russia's Success in the Far East") Lenin pointed out: Tsarist Russia had carried out "a policy of plunder against China for several decades." ("Speech to the International Mass Meeting in Berne") "The devil's claws of the greedy European capitalists have already reached out to China. The Russian Government is perhaps the first to stretch its devil's claws." ("The War in China") Stalin said: "Who does not know that the exploitation of the vast areas in Turkey, Persia and China and their occupation by the Tsarist system were merged with the war for annexation of territory?" ("On the Foundation of Leninism") However, in today's Soviet revisionist "historical works" like "China's Modern History" edited by Tikhvinskiy, the description of the events is entirely different: "The Russian Government distinguished itself from the Western powers in that it pursued a different kind of China policy, dedicated to the building of friendly neighborly relations."*** "Russia was not the same as Britain and France. In the

---

* Soviet magazine "Modern and Contemporary History," 1973 No. 1 issue.

** Soviet magazine "Afro-Asian People," 1972 No. 5 issue, article by Belinewboskiy (别列柳勃斯基).

*** Edited by Tikhvinskiy, "China's Modern History," 1972 edition of Moscow Science Publishing House, p. 98.

middle of the 19th century, it continued to maintain good neighborly relations with China."* "The Tsarist Government had neither taken the initiative to impose unequal treaties on China nor actively supported a series of treaties concluded after 1860." "The trade between Russia and China was conducted through caravans, completely equal in nature; the boundary dividing the Ch'ing Empire and the Russian Empire -- the longest land boundary in the world -- was established through peaceful diplomatic means, based on the 1858 'Aigun Treaty' and "Tientsin Treaty'."** And so on.

Please look, do these self-styled "Marxist historical works" still smack of Marxism? None, not a bit. They only show the ugly features of the renegades from Marxism. What do these changes in Soviet historical works, past and present, show? They point to nothing else but the fact that in the hands of the Soviet revisionists, "historical research" has degenerated into an instrument of the new Tsars in pushing their aggressive policies, an instrument used for the purpose of forging a historical basis for the new Tsars' foreign aggression and expansion. To meet such needs, they must describe bandits as heroes, aggression as friendship, expansion as development, plunder as aid, and enslavement as liberation. Therefore, the ugly scars of the old Tsars must not be exposed but must be covered with make-up. The statue of the butcher must not be toppled but must be coated with gold and worshipped. And so, as regards the criminal history of Tsarist Russia's aggression against China and other nations, despite the brilliant statements made by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin long ago, despite the fair comments made in early Soviet historical works, and despite the clear language certain people wrote in their own works, sorry, we must revise it. That's all!

In conclusion, it may be mentioned in passing that a few years ago, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique in a solemn "government statement" accused others of "manipulating historical data at random."*** But the cold fact is that it is you, and not others, who have played with historical material like children playing blocks. Let's advise the Soviet revisionist lords: You had better give up early this game of a thief shouting "catch the thief"! History is serious. Whoever plays with or insults history will certainly be punished by history. Such is the dialectics of history.

* * *

END

---

* Ibid., p. 167.

** Ibid., p. 240.

*** Statement of the Soviet Government, June 13, 1969.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service
Springfield, Va. 22161

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PRINTED MATTER

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
COM-211

U.S.MAIL

CMP X751231 001
UNIV ILLINOIS LIB AT CHICAGO CIRCLE
LIB SERIALS SEC
BOX 8198
CHICAGO IL 60680